

The University of Chicago

FOUNDED BY JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER

Price \$1.00
Per Year

Single Copies
5 Cents

UNIVERSITY RECORD

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

CHICAGO

The University of Chicago Press

VOL. III, NO. 15.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT 3:00 P.M.

JULY 8, 1898.

Entered in the post office Chicago, Illinois, as second-class matter.

CONTENTS.

I. The Founders of States and the Founders of Colleges. By the Hon. William L. Wilson, LL.D.	85-90
II. Special Announcements for the Summer Quarter	90
III. Greetings from the Founder of the University	91
IV. Official Reports: Library	91
V. Current Events	92
VI. The Calendar	92

THE FOUNDERS OF STATES AND THE FOUNDERS OF COLLEGES.*

BY THE HON. WILLIAM L. WILSON, LL.D.,

President of Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va.

The invitation which calls me to this honorable service tells me that in the calendar of the University of Chicago this day is set apart as Founder's Day. Even if this fact does not select the theme of my address, it is suggestive of more than one instructive line of thought. It is well for a school, as it is well for a state, that it can celebrate a founder's day, not only by recurring and deserved tribute to benefactors, but by thoughtful review of past achievement, and equally thoughtful consideration of future destiny. In truth there are few great schools and still fewer great states, of which it can be said with historical accuracy, that any one man was the founder, or that any company of men laid the real basis on which they have risen. As it is an element of strength for a

college, so it is an element of strength for a commonwealth, a solid augury of future happiness, when its annals are rich with names imperishably associated with the crises through which it has grown into greatness and freedom; it may be with names of soldiers who have won or who have defended national existence; it may be of statesmen and legislators who have made clear the principles of that existence and successfully applied them in the art and work of government; and, in an equally true sense, it may be of those who have enlarged the conditions under which soldiers, and statesmen and legislators may be trained for this service to their country.

As we enjoy the fruit of their labors it is our duty to recall their patriotic services, to honor their examples, and from service and example to gather faithfulness, and, if need be, heroism, to carry onward their work as it comes to our hands. Freedom is a heritage. It comes to abide with no people as an accident or as the unearned and free gift of fortune. It is the slow and steady accumulation of homely savings, of unselfish sacrifices, of persistent, well-directed thrift. It must be preserved by the same virtues that won it; like any other heritage, it may be squandered by spendthrift hands, or forfeited by weak and faithless hands. It is safe only where it is held not so much as a heritage to enjoy but as a trust to transmit. Tested by the ideas in which we have been trained, and the fruits we have been accustomed to pluck, it is still a very rare thing even in the civilized world of today. It has been short-lived and tumultuous in most of the countries and ages of the past. History has the rec-

*The Convocation Address delivered in connection with the Twenty-third Convocation of the University, held in the Graduate Quadrangle, July 1, 1898.

ord of many nations that have been great in the greatness of war, of numbers, of wealth, of art, and letters and jurisprudence, few indeed that have been great in the greatness of freedom. It was the warning of this momentous truth that Patrick Henry uttered in the Virginia Convention of 1788, that was considering the ratification of the Constitution, when he said, "You are not to enquire how your trade may be increased, nor how you are to become a great and powerful people, but how your liberties are to be secured; for liberty ought to be the direct end of your government." And it was the recognition of this momentous truth that led so many whom we revere as founders of American Commonwealths to become also founders of American Colleges. They knew how to build, and they knew the conditions of durable building. They knew that their work as builders was foredoomed to the failure which had overtaken like work in the past, unless the free government they were seeking to organize could be buttressed for all time by the schoolhouse, the college, and the university.

The institution from which I come, modest indeed compared with such a school as this, has behind it one hundred and fifty years of honest work, but the turning point in its history was when Washington selected it, a weak and starveling academy that had sent stout soldiers into his army, for that timely and, in his day, munificent endowment which has remained ever since an unimpaired and productive source of its support.

Jefferson himself wrote the inscription placed on the pedestal of his monument which proclaims to posterity that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, of the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, and the father of the University of Virginia. Benjamin Franklin had years before laid the first stone in the foundation of what is now the University of Pennsylvania. Every North Carolina name that was signed to the Federal Constitution in 1787 reappeared in 1789 among the charter trustees of the university of that state. And I might go on adding to these examples.

For all of these schools liberal education, in the customary meaning of the phrase, was an appointed task; but in all of them the study of history, of politics, of the science of government—in other words, preparation for the service of the state—for intelligent citizenship in self-governing states—was a prominent, in some of them a primary object. "In a republic," said Washington, "what species of knowledge can be equally important?" The commanding influence of southern leaders in the national councils in the *anti-bellum* days is sometimes explained by super-

ficial and unworthy reasons. Mr. Blaine gave the true source of that influence when he wrote of them: "that having before them the examples of Jefferson and Madison and George Mason in Virginia, of Nathaniel Macon in North Carolina, of the Pinckneys and Rutledges in South Carolina, they gave deep study to the science of government," with the inevitable result that knowledge gave the same influence and the same right to lead in the fields of politics and statesmanship that it gives in every other great field of human endeavor. What thickening, and in the end fatal, disasters must overtake our experiment, if, in the words of the old Greek, we allow ourselves to believe that the hardest of all trades—the trade of government—is the only trade for which no learning is necessary.

If then in the beginning of our constitutional self-government the founders of states believed their own task unfinished, their own work insecure, until they had planted colleges for the training of men to continue that work, may it not be truly said that in this generation the founders and benefactors of colleges are, in like spirit, obeying the call of patriotism in strengthening the basis of our freedom and steadily increasing the forces that stand guard over its priceless treasures? For such is the work of every college and university in the country that is not held in the fetters of political or sectarian bigotry, but is honestly and fearlessly seeking to know and to propagate the truth—the truth, moral, political, and scientific, that makes men free; of yours at the University of Chicago with your great plant, your great endowment, your great libraries, and, most of all, with your great teachers; of ours at Washington and Lee and at other schools in the South, with our meager resources, meager equipments, and fewer, but not less faithful, teachers. You are indeed to be congratulated that in this great battle for American freedom you can move forward like the modern battleship, with all the resources of wealth, and knowledge, and science, and mechanical skill at your command; we, perhaps, are to be pitied, that as yet we must bear our part with the less effective equipment of the old-time navies; but whether with the battleship or wooden vessel, whether with the guns of Dewey or with those of Nelson, the cause is a common cause to all of us. As you succeed, protection comes to us; if we fail, even your success is shorn of much of its fruits.

When I thus speak of the hard and never ending struggle for good government as a battle, I am using a sounding and well worn metaphor, that may seem sophomoric on such a platform as this, but it is none the less an accurate and historical statement. A bat-

tle, or better, perhaps, a war it has been in the generations of the past; a war it will continue to be in all the generations that are to come. Nor did this struggle begin with the beginning of our government. It is true that certain names stand forth, as I have said, as the founders of our Federal Republic. Professor Fiske names five men, as ranking before all others in the making of our government, following the chronological order of their dominating influence, Washington, Madison, Hamilton, Marshall, and Jefferson. We rightly honor them for all that they did, and with them their great coworkers. Yet when in accurate and stricter obedience to historic truth we attempt to trace the evolution of our Federal Republic, and especially of those representative institutions that make freedom and self-government possible in a great continental nation, who can take his stand at any particular point and say, here the fountain first leaped forth that has swelled into the mighty river? Who can say that this was the time when, this the place where, and this the man by whom, the foundation stones of American liberty were laid?

If we go back to the Federal Convention of 1787 accepting Mr. Gladstone's statement that the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man, we are obliged to check and interpret that statement by the reflections with which Mr. Bancroft closes his history of the formation of the Constitution, that, while its framers "molded its design by a creative power of their own, yet they introduced nothing that did not always exist or was not a natural development of a well-known principle." If then we go still further back to the controversy that precipitated the war for independence and read the petition sent to King George as late as 1774 by the members of the General Congress, that faded writing still to be seen in the State Paper office in London, with the signatures of Washington, Henry, Richard Henry Lee, the two Adamses, John and Samuel, and Roger Sherman, we find that the entire case of the colonies was summed up in the claim that they were "born heirs of freedom," and the entire demand of the colonists was summed in their protest against "being degraded from the preëminent rank of English freemen." If we pass over five hundred years to that parliament, to which Simon de Montfort summoned Knights of the shires and burgesses of the towns to represent the entire body of English freemen, the historians meet us there and assure us that Simon merely recovered for the people through the device of representation, the old right which they had exercised in their own persons, until such exercise was made impossible by

extent of territory and growth of numbers. If we go back still further to the Great Charter wrung from King John by the Army of God and the Holy Church, which has ever since been revered as the groundwork of English liberty, we find that charter demanding no new right, but merely containing a precise, deliberate, and complete declaration of ancient rights and liberties as those rights had been declared in earlier charters, or had been immemorially enjoyed by unwritten customs. And when at last we lose the guidance of recorded history and by the aid of comparative politics and comparative philology, seek to ascertain from the common stock which had not yet parted into Greek, Roman, and Teuton, the primeval political system which contained the germs of the Athenian democracy, of Roman oligarchy, and of English parliament, we find that it had already taken the "first firm steps in the growth of social order, military discipline, and civil government."

The history of our freedom then has been not so much a history of achievement as a history of preservation. The task has not been to win a new possession, but to defend an old one, to bear it safely along the march of human progress, through all the advancing and receding stages of civilization, amid the accidents and changes and perils which steadily increase in number and in portent as the world grows into that "vast and complicated thing," which is the only definition M. Taine can find for modern society.

If one after another of the nations and peoples of the world has lost its freedom in the stately procession of the ages, some surrendering it to the "wild and many-weaponed throng that hangs upon its front and flank and rear," and others marring by changes

"— — — all too fierce and vast
This order of the Human Star,
This heritage of the past,"

it is our supreme happiness to stand in the single line down which its traditions have come with unsteady, it may be, but never-failing progress, widening from precedent to precedent. If today and in the near future those traditions seem threatened by new perils and new temptations that spring from beneath the chariot wheels of triumphant progress, of our industrial advancement, and our military achievement, it is the more incumbent on patriot and scholar to clear the mind and to cleanse the bosom of all error as to the origin and history of our freedom and the organic conditions under which it must operate through the machinery of self-governing institutions. It must not be forgotten that it has never been the stable creation of theories, however dazzling and magnificent, but the growth of slow, steady, and

silent progress. Even its so-called founders and apostles have been men who have faithfully and loyally done merely the next thing, being sure that the next thing was the right thing as tested by the standards of the past. By this wisdom alone have they insured healthy and consistent progress, linking freedom and order into bonds of union and escaping the anarchy and deeds of blood which have too often accompanied the hurried strides of revolution, and, in the name of liberty, driven mankind from its worship.

How many a glorious dawn has reddened and darkened into night of terror as mere theory, fanaticism, intoxication of power or of glory, have sought to hasten or to undo the work of evolution and to remodel human life or society by their crude and fanciful notions.

The founders of our republic were never swept from their firm footing by any such delusive ideas. That "creative power," which Mr. Bancroft attributes to them and which they possessed beyond all other state builders in history, was, as he further testifies, merely exercised in the strong and harmonious organization of materials that were the gift of the ages, and he might have added, with equal truth, the creative power itself was the rarest and most precious of these gifts of the ages. They understood their task and its inexorable conditions and therefore they succeeded in that task. Names signify little; written constitutions signify little; universal suffrage is no warranty. The potential energy, the soul and living spirit of freedom, does not reside in any of these, nor yet in charters, or bills or petitions of right, or in statutes, but in the political training, the individual enlightenment, the individual morality of a people, and in devotion to personal liberty, in men who having these for their pole-star are not borne to and fro by the shifting tides of popular opinion or popular madness, but who steer right onward, able and willing "to maintain the day against the hour and the year against the day."

Institutions have never made a people free; a free people will always make for themselves free institutions. And so on this Founder's Day of one of the greatest schools of our country, destined to wield an ever-expanding power in fitting men for the work of governing themselves, we may fitly brush aside much of the cant of the scholar in politics, and stand at close quarters with that duty which rests upon all schools, and with greater weight upon such a University, of making, not scholars in politics, but of fitting all over whom its molding power extends for the honest, robust, everyday work of American citizenship.

That work, I have already said, grows in difficulty and grows in the gravity of its issues with the growth of our country. Effectual public service, effectual and sagacious leadership, cannot be easier in a nation of seventy-five millions of population than it was in a nation of fifty millions or of ten millions. Problems of statesmanship, domestic and foreign, and questions to be decided by universal suffrage cannot be simpler in a republic extending from sea to sea, or, it may soon be, beyond the seas, with its confusion of races, its multitudinous cities, its increasing wealth, its confusing clamor of warring interests, its use of the new and tremendous forces of social and industrial progress, than they were for a people whose chief population fronted the Atlantic seaboard, and whose chief occupation was the pursuit of agriculture.

It is strange that the ablest statesman and the wisest citizen often stands in the presence of such problems modest and perplexed, trusting to time and to the natural vigor of freedom rather than to his own devices to bring us safely through them, while the demagogue and the charlatan rush forward with their nostrums, all tending to their own profit or advancement, like empiric physicians of whom Lord Bacon says that they "commonly have a few pleasant receipts whereof they are confident and adventurous, but know neither the causes of diseases, nor the constitution of patients, the perils of accident nor the true methods of cures."

It is no pessimism, nor "ethical culturism" as it is now sometimes crushingly called, nor waning faith in democratic government, but the calm, brave patriotism that has safely guided through all the crises of the past, that sees great evils to overcome, great reforms to accomplish and great dangers to avoid in our country today.

So it was for our fathers; so it will be for our sons. As the fathers saved us from the dangers that hung over their heads it is for us to save our sons from the dangers that hang over ours. That these dangers are real and grave, a mere mention of some of them will prove.

The hierarchical organization of great parties introduces into the actual working of our government, federal or state, a force never anticipated by the makers of the constitution, or where anticipated, looked forward to with unconcealed apprehension and distrust. It has completely nullified their carefully devised and highly praised Electoral College system for the choice of President, by which they hoped to secure the discreet selection of the discreetest men. While party is necessary for the working of government the very perfection of its organization discloses

evils of gravest import. The leadership passes more and more from able statesmen to able organizers, from men who saturate politics with thought to men who think little and know little of public questions, but who think and know much of party management, of the winning of elections, and, to that end of the loosest bonds of principle with the closest bonds of organization.

The chief end of party activity, in the eyes of such leaders, not unnaturally is to gain party victories, and the chief use of party victories is to reward partisan activity and to strengthen party organization.

Real and vital issues, if dangerous to deal with, will be avoided and treated in platform and in legislation with more regard to the success of party than to the permanent good of country.

In truth, we have seen political organizations in the presence of such inconvenient issues, become as oracular and crafty as the presidential candidate whose position on the slavery question Mr. Bigelow made free to inquire :

"Ez to principles I glory
In hev'in' nothing of the sort;
I aint a wig, I aint a tory,
I'm just a candidate in short.

But if we concede something, as I think we must, to the prudence of political as to that, of military generals, there are two unmixed evils connected with the thorough organization and heady struggles of our great parties which ought to be warred against by all good citizens. The evolution of the party "boss" has degraded some of our great states into rotten boroughs which servilely return the candidates nominated by that boss to the legislatures of the states and nation, and make all petty party leaders but retainers and feudatories of an absolute master.

Neither can we shut our eyes to the fact that there is a progressive corruption of the ballot-box in all our great campaigns and even in local contests. So notorious is this, so tacitly approved and winked at by men who are willing to commit fraud for party that they would scorn to commit for self, that it seems almost impossible to arouse a public sentiment strong enough to demand laws for its punishment or to execute those laws if they happen to get upon the statute book.

I might enumerate many other dangers which threaten or obstruct the full and harmonious progress of free government. I prefer to cite one which lies entirely without the arena of partisan dispute, and one which all citizens of all parties must recognize and deplore, even where they make no effort to eradicate. I cite it, as a grave danger and the perpetual foun-

tain of grave dangers, to give emphasis to the truth I have already stated, that the preservation of freedom is a task for which every generation must struggle anew, and for the supreme task of self-government must gather to its aid all the resources of patriotism, morality, and education. Mr. Cobden, at the close of the particular struggle associated with his name, looked back with longing to the days when there were great battles to fight, objects to accomplish worthy the energies of men, and something at stake worth growing older and grayer for. For such a nation as ours there can be few periods, and those of brief duration, when such objects are not clear to the eyes of thoughtful statesmanship. How many of such questions have crowded upon us since the twenty-first day of last April alone? questions as grave and as decisive of our destiny, and it may be of our freedom, as the gravest issues of the past?

Can democracy, acting by universal suffrage, deal wisely, safely, and decisively with its problems, some of which are lifted above the common knowledge and the common experience of busy men—even of educated men?

In the law of general education, of colleges and universities, and newspapers, we cannot admit that the intelligence and training, and, above all, the free discussions, which are equal to the solution of so many problems that have puzzled and even overwhelmed other generations and other peoples, will in the end fall before the new problems that involve our prosperity and imperil our freedom. But we cannot safely spare or neglect any of the forces which can aid us in this stupendous work. And he who founds a school of learning, or who adds to the capacity and energy of an existing school, is a coworker with him who is saluted and honored as the founder of a state or as the broadener of its freedom. The one helps to preserve what the other has helped to establish. A great university can never for one hour in any one day, forget its true position and its paramount work in a free state.

If it does not deepen the sense of civic duty, if it does not mold into the stamina of its students, the mental training and the moral virtue needed to reach right conclusions on political issues, and to stand for those conclusions with the steadfastness of true patriotism and the power of high intelligence, it ceases to be a bulwark of the state, and becomes a source of danger in proportion as intellectual development gives increase of power and of cunning to its possessor.

A great American statesman who pondered as anxiously and as deeply as any man in our history the

principles of free government and the fundamental conditions of its permanent enjoyment, has given us a lesson, which is likewise a warning, in words that ought to be written over the portals of every college and university and legislative chamber in the country: "Liberty is a reward reserved for the intelligent, the patriotic, the virtuous and the deserving."

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR THE SUMMER QUARTER.

I. CHAPEL ASSEMBLIES.

The different divisions of the University meet in the Chapel, Cobb Lecture Hall, at 10:30 A.M., as follows:

Junior Colleges on Monday } Attendance
Senior Colleges on Tuesday } required.

College students will sit by divisions. Seat tickets for the Chapel Assemblies have been distributed at the Division Meeting on Friday, July 1st, at 10:30 A.M. Graduate Schools on Thursday, Divinity School on Friday.

While thus an Assembly is provided for each division of the University on a particular day, all students are welcome to attend any or all of the Assemblies above announced. The attendance of Unclassified Students, which may be with any of the Assemblies, as well as that of Graduate and Divinity students is voluntary. The Chapel exercises consist of a brief religious service and such official announcements as may be desirable.

II. VESPER SERVICES.

On each Sunday afternoon at 4 o'clock there is held in the auditorium of Kent Chemical Laboratory a Vesper Service, to which all members of the University are invited. Beside the musical programme, there will be a brief address. The name of the speaker and the subject will be published each week in the UNIVERSITY RECORD and on the bulletin boards.

III. GENERAL LECTURES.

Throughout the Quarter there is given a series of general lectures by speakers representing the different departments of University work. These lectures will be given in most cases at 4:00 P.M. The rooms and subjects for each week will be published in the UNIVERSITY RECORD of the preceding week and posted on the bulletin boards.

PROFESSOR GASTON BONET-MAURY, of the University of Paris, will give a series of twelve lectures during

the second three weeks of the First "History of the Struggle for Liberty of France since the Edict of Nantes and Slavs," as follows:

1. Religious Liberty in General: Religious See the Slavs.
2. John Huss,—the Precursor of the Reformati
3. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes and t in France.
4. The War of the Camisards: the Prophets c and the Meetings in the South.
5. Peter Cheltsky and the Bohemian Brothers.
6. John Lasky and Protestantism in Poland.
7. The Reorganization and Martyrs of the Proto France in the Eighteenth Century.
8. Amos Comenius and the Moravians.
9. The Edict of Toleration (1787) and the Amer
10. J. J. Rousseau and the Triumph of Religious
11. Leon Tolstoi and the Martyrs of the Protesti in Russia.
12. The Antisemitic Movement and the Prese Religious Liberty in France.

PROFESSOR JOHN HENRY BARROWS will of six lectures during the second term on "The Conquest of Asia."—Observations of religion in the Orient (The "Hasker for 1898):

1. The Cross and the Crescent in Asia. Su
2. Observations of Popular Hinduism. Tue
3. Philosophic Hinduism. Thur
4. Some difficulties of the Hindu Mind in accer ity. Su
5. Christianity and Buddhism in Asia. Tue
6. Confucianism and the Awakening of China. Thurs

No credit is given for this course.

PROFESSOR L. A. SHERMAN, of the Nebraska, is giving a series of thirteen "The Interpretation of Literature." The lectures are these:

5. Art-Portraiture of Personality, in Degree.
6. Moods and Passions as Subject-matter in Li
7. The Dynamics of Characterization.
8. Paramount Modes and Means of Imaginativ
9. The Relations of Prosaic and Interpretative
10. The Literary Elements.
11. The Literary Elements, continued: Literar
12. Criteria and Degrees of Literary Excellence
13. Higher Aspects of Literary Synthesis.

The following course of lectures will b German language:

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR VON KLENZE: "Lena
MR. ALMSTEDT: "Eine Fuesstour in Thüring
DR. KERN: "Der Civis academicus im deute
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR CUTTING: "Einige
über die Aufgabe des Sprachlehrers."